

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 have been amended. Claims 11 and 12 have been added. Thus, claims 1-12 are pending in the present application.

I. Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to certain informalities in claims 1, 2, 6, and 7. Applicant amended these claims respectively to correct punctuation and missing words.

II. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, and 10 were rejected as being anticipated by Fleming et al. Applicant amended independent claims 1 and 6 to more clearly define the present invention. The present invention is concerned with drag and drop procedures usable in computer applications. The amended claims now limit the present independent claims to drag and drop procedures with respect to dialogs. Dialogs differ from normal windows as they allow for the input of information and for editing its content. Figure 2 of the present application shows such a dialog structure in form of tabular files. Not each file is completely viewable and comprises concealed portions. The tabs of each file, however, are always visible. Once a user moves the cursor over one of these tabs, the respective file will be displayed and the user can drop a respective object into the file.

Fleming discloses a standard window system with a plurality of windows. However, these windows do not operate like dialogs. A standard window does not provide for data entry and for editing of the data as it is possible with a dialog. Every system clearly distinguishes between standard windows and dialogs. Therefore, Applicant believes that Fleming does not anticipate the amended claim.

III. Dependent claims

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are dependent claims which include all limitations of at least the respective independent claims 1, 16 or 17. Therefore, these claims are allowable at least to the extent of the respective independent claim 1, 16 or 17. The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming in view of Yellepeddy. The Examiner states that Yellepeddy discloses that a concealed register is moved to the foreground after a predetermined time period. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner cited col. 5, lns. 59-60 of Yellepeddy. However, Yellepeddy is completely unrelated to the present invention. Yellepeddy's system concerns a printer spooler system. The only comparable action is that an object can be dragged on a printer symbol. This invokes printing of the object. However, the objects content will not be displayed in a dialog. Neither will a dialog be created. The referenced sentence in line 59-60 states that at a user specified interval certain interaction between a spooler and a transient printer queue will take place. However, these are non visible interactions. No dialog box will appear. In particular, no concealed part of a dialog box will appear after a predetermined time period once a cursor has been moved to the visible part of a dialog. Therefore, Applicant believes that Yellepeddy is not related art and a combination of Yellepeddy and Fleming will not render claims 3 and 8 obvious.

Furthermore, Applicant added new claims 11 and 12. These dependent claims comprise the additional feature of indicating possible drop locations for an object that has been selected. None of the cited prior art discloses this feature.

CONCLUSION

As hereby amended, claims 1-12 are pending in the application. The application as defined in the pending claims is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 in view of Fleming and in view of Fleming and Yellepeddy. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all pending claims.


SUMMARY

In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested. Early notice of the allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney of record by telephone, facsimile or electronic mail, as below.

Applicants do not believe that any other fees are due in with the filing of this Response to Final Office Action. However, should the Commissioner deem that any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 be required for any reason relating to this document, including any fees for any extensions of time, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fees to Baker Botts L.L.P. **Deposit Account No. 02-0383, Order Number 071308.0416.**

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.



Andreas H. Grubert

(Limited recognition 37 C.F.R. §10.9)

One Shell Plaza

910 Louisiana Street

Houston, Texas 77002-4995

Telephone: 713.229.1964

Facsimile: 713.229.7764

AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

Date: June 23, 2004